

One option for a cost model would be to consider the use of existing facilities placed by other industries. For the most part, the nation's CATV and power networks are in-place and in-service. (The Joint Board quite correctly does not suggest that a model of telephone network construction costs should assume "green fields" for every utility or be predicated on the complete reconstruction or new construction of these other utilities' networks.) If these utilities sized their structures to permit leasing of excess capacity to another company or companies, there might be capacity available for use by a new telephone company...

In their supplementary Hatfield Model (Version 2.2.2) filing, the sponsors stated that: "It is more than reasonable to assume that, on a forward-looking basis, ... ILECs will be able to recover an increasing portion of their structure costs through joint ownership or rental arrangements."²⁵ This appears to be an unreasonable assumption, given that the electric companies and CATV companies already have their networks built.

If, on the other hand, the ILECs were to place all new structures for their new, forward-looking network, we must assume they would size them in compliance with the FCC's constraints on the model, including the "least cost" constraint that precludes construction of surplus structure capacity. A design engineer might assume that under some circumstances the true "least cost" might be a shared new construction cost and that the telephone company should build and lease excess new, forward-looking structure capacity to reduce aggregate costs. In this case, the telephone company will face a marketing problem: the networks of the other utilities already exist. There are no other companies with whom to share these structures, except, perhaps, a hypothetical ELEC. (We must exclude the cases of new sub-divisions because the guidelines given to the model developers preclude considerations of future growth in demand.)

Practical Considerations

Beyond the philosophical issues associated with these observations, there are several tangible practical issues associated with structure sharing. Regarding aerial plant, currently accepted, industry-wide engineering practices dictate minimal use of aerial facilities. This design principal recognizes 1) the higher whole-life costs (in-

²⁵ AT&T and MCI Submission on the Hatfield Proxy Model (Ex Parte Presentation - Proxy Cost Model Questions, CC Docket 96-45), January 7, 1997, page 20.

cluding maintenance) of the facilities, 2) the exposure of the aerial facilities to more and greater environmental hazards, and 3) the zoning requirements of many local governments regarding design aesthetics. Consequently, any assumption regarding the mix of aerial, buried and underground plant based solely on first costs would likely be untenable. Indeed, the FCC recognizes that a model should "minimize the total lifetime cost, including maintenance, of outside structure plant mix."²⁶

Similarly, an undersized manhole would not provide the capacity necessary for significant sharing or lease.²⁷ Specifying small manholes in the model would serve to reduce the cost of manholes in the model's calculation, and therefore understates the true cost of network construction. More significant to the present discussion, it would preclude the high volume of structure sharing suggested by some model developers.

Under certain circumstances, regulatory authorities or responsible outside plant planning design principles dictate the sharing of duct. In these cases, users must make substantial modifications to the model, including changes in the size and price of the manholes and in the number and cost of multiple ducts. Moreover, users would need to incorporate the costs attributable to "proving" the duct and to cable pulling in the duct. These supplementary costs would obviate some or all of the benefit of structure sharing.

Shared trenches are more expensive than standard trenches. There will be an increase in construction placement costs in most cases if trenches or other facilities are shared or jointly occupied. In most cases, a shared trench must be deeper and

²⁶ Federal Communications Commission, *Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, FCC 97-256, Released July 18, 1997, paragraph 56, page 27.

²⁷ *Outside Plant Engineering Handbook*, August 1994, AT&T Network Systems Document Number 900-200-318, Winston-Salem, North Carolina (Republished October, 1996 by Lucent Technologies), page 8-43, Table "Precast General Use Manholes."

wider to accommodate the additional utilities that are participating in the shared or common trenching. This is a function of the requirements for minimum separation in horizontal and vertical planes mandated by the governing authorities. These supplementary costs also would obviate some or all of the benefit of structure sharing.

Summary

Because the assumed percentage of structure sharing impacts calculations in such a profound manner, it seems intuitively obvious why the developers of the models have been preoccupied with suggesting the specific percentages that have been used in the models. In this context, the findings by Christensen Associates are extremely important.²⁸ To determine the effect of structure sharing on average monthly line costs, they standardized these costs and compared the results with the averages for five states (Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Missouri and Montana).

In aggregate, with raw data inputs, the Hatfield Model 5.0 generated average monthly line costs that were 43% lower than the average monthly line costs generated by the BCPM 3.0. With standardized data inputs, the Hatfield Model 5.0 generated average monthly line costs that were only 16% lower than the average monthly line costs generated by the BCPM 3.0. Christensen Associates observe that the remaining differences are attributable in large part to other input values and to basic loop engineering methods.

We conclude that structure sharing is far too critical a parameter in these models to be left to user discretion. The FCC's tentative conclusion to adopt 66 percent as "an acceptable aggregate default input value for the percent of costs assigned to the telephone company for all other shared facilities" is a reasonable step toward re-

²⁸ *Analysis of Benchmark Cost Proxy Model 3.0, Hatfield Model, Version 5.0 and Hybrid Cost Proxy Model*, Christensen Associates, January 14, 1998, pages 31-34, especially Table 11.

solving the problem.²⁹ During the final stages of the development of these models, public discussion must be directed to resolving the matter of structure sharing to prevent gross distortions in the output of the model finally selected by the FCC. At the very least, we encourage the FCC to moderate discussion of this issue and defuse this particularly disputatious situation.

Input Prices and Related Input Values

There are numerous instances of on-going problems with the input data used by the developers of the models, despite the guidance offered by the FCC and other commentators. Aside from the question of structure sharing, for example, the developers still appear to be divided on the issue of the cost of capital.

The fundamental issue in loop engineering is the level of investment in given technologies. The sponsors of the models clearly diverge along an easily defined line. The BCPM sponsors have selected inputs that they believe will define a reasonable quality communications network under the constraint of minimizing whole-life cost. The Hatfield Model sponsors have selected inputs that they believe will minimize initial construction costs under the constraint of providing minimally acceptable transmissions. In this sense, none of the models is truly optimizing, although the BCPM 3.0 certainly comes closest to meeting this description (of the three models considered here).

It is no surprise, then, that based on the expected quality of telephone services the BCPM 3.0 remains the superior model. In matters such as basic engineering, the Hatfield Model 5.0 selects wire gauge based on pair count, which is a dubious methodology at best. The selection of gauge should be based on transmission quality,

²⁹ Federal Communications Commission, *Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, FCC 97-256, Released July 18, 1997, paragraph 81, page 35.

while the selection of pair count should be based on current and near term requirements. (Similarly, it is no surprise that the Hatfield Model 5.0 consistently provides estimates of construction costs that are substantially lower than the whole-life costs of the BCPM 3.0.)

In another example, the Hatfield Model 5.0 has made little progress in clarifying the costs of switching, preferring to use a "blended configuration of switch technologies."³⁰ This lack of progress is most striking in view of the FCC's specific guidance on this topic, which encouraged more explicit definition of switching costs.³¹

The question of appropriate inputs is absolutely fundamental to the model building process. AT&T and MCI assert that the HCPM "appears to taper cable size excessively."³² The sponsors of the BCPM observe that the Hatfield Model uses resistance parameters in loop design that "necessitate the use of an extended range line card which is twice the cost of a standard POTS line card."³³ The record of debate on universal services, which FCC Commissioner Susan Ness observed "stands at more than 100,000 pages and counting," is filled with such examples of the importance of standardizing the inputs to these models to permit true and equitable evaluation of the models.³⁴

³⁰ HAI Consulting, *Hatfield Model Release 5.0 Model Description*, December 11, 1997, page 52.

³¹ Federal Communications Commission Public Notice, *Guidance to Proponents of Cost Models in Universal Service Proceeding: Switching, Interoffice Trunking, Signaling and Local Tandem Investment*, DA 97-1912, Released September 3, 1997, section I, pages 2-4.

³² *Comments of AT&T Corp. and MCI Telecommunications Corporation*, November 26, 1997, section 3, page 5.

³³ *Joint Comments of BellSouth Corporation, BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., US West, Inc., and Sprint Local Telephone Companies to Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Sections III.C.5, 7, 8 and III.D Platform, III.B.3 & III.C All Inputs and IV and V*, October 17, 1997, Section II.A.3, page 8.

³⁴ "Separate Statement of Commissioner Susan Ness," December 30, 1977, page 2, released in connection with FCC Common Carrier Action Report No. CC 97-61, *Commission Addresses Universal Services Issues Raised by Petitioners*, December 30, 1977.

Loop Engineering Assumptions

Advanced Services

The BCPM supports the provisioning of advanced services, allowing for deployment by density zone to reflect the localization of business demand. However, in its default mode the Hatfield Model 5.0 does not permit such provisioning. Even when the model is modified to permit high bandwidth transmission, the service cannot be offered differentially across density zones.

This is particularly compelling in view of the expected growth in demand for services that the Joint Board currently defines as "unsupported," but which must be incorporated in the engineering plans of telephone companies. The FCC acknowledges this necessity in its Public Notice that states a forward-looking mechanism "should not impede the provision of advanced services."³⁵

The authors of the HCPM acknowledge that the "HCPM models only those components of the network that are associated with providing residential and business services using the least-cost equipment available today."³⁶

Network Growth

In addition, there is a problem with calculating distances from the central offices only to **current** subscribers. The Hatfield Model 5.0 incorporates no provision for growth, presumably because of the "scorched node" approach dictated by the proceedings to date. However, sound engineering principles and least total cost economic plan-

³⁵ Federal Communications Commission Public Notice, *Guidance to Proponents of Cost Models in Universal Service Proceeding: Customer Location and Outside Plant*, DA 97-2372, Released November 13, 1997, page 5.

³⁶ Correspondence: William W. Sharkey and D. Mark Kennett to Magalie Roman Salas, "Subject: Additional Information Pertaining to the December 11, 1997 Release of the Hybrid Cost proxy Model,"

ning principles dictate the assumption of some growth and the design of a distribution system that will accommodate ultimate demand.

This problem is related, in part, to the use of line density measurements rather than household density measurements. The network is still being built in many parts of the country. Current line density, as opposed to household density, does not reflect the need to connect all subscribers who desire service. The selected model should identify the locations of all current and potential customers and build the network to satisfy this demand. The fact that such construction is inconvenient to market entrants who focus their efforts on business customers in urban areas is irrelevant.³⁷

The Hatfield Model 5.0 seems to assume that telephone companies will build this network instantaneously. This, of course, is an unreasonable assumption. We emphasize that this is more than a philosophical problem. The assumption precludes satisfying the Hatfield Model 5.0's expectations related to joint construction and structure sharing, certainly for buried placement and probably for many underground placements.

The Hatfield Model 5.0 assumes that the telephone company will build the local network to satisfy a perfectly known demand. Consequently, the Hatfield Model Version 5.0 does not appear to include any break down of costs to reflect variable construction quantities. This makes any attempt to compare the specified unit prices with prices established by professional experience very difficult.³⁸

December 23, 1997, page 1.

³⁷ This observation responds directly to the query in Federal Communications Commission, *Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, FCC 97-256, Released July 18, 1997, paragraph 67, page 30.

³⁸ Robert F. Austin, Ph.D. *Engineering Evaluation of Cost Proxy Models for Determining Universal Service Support: Hatfield Model 3.0/3.1*, Ex Parte Filing, Federal Communications Commission Docket No. 96-45, March 17, 1997, page 30.

According to its authors, the HCPM "assumes that the network being modelled would be built today to meet the user determined demand."³⁹ It seems clear from this statement and from the operation of the model that the authors have not provided for network growth.

As with distance, structure sharing and other input values, specific parameters for loop engineering must be agreed upon to advance the discussion.

³⁹ Correspondence: William W. Sharkey and D. Mark Kennett to Magalie Roman Salas, "Subject: Additional Information Pertaining to the December 11, 1997 Release of the Hybrid Cost proxy Model," December 23, 1997, Page 1.

Conclusion

In conjunction with its release, FCC Commissioner Michael K. Powell observed that the *Fourth Order on Reconsideration* "makes minor adjustments to a universal service framework that, if one assumes the framework is valid, are themselves relatively unobjectionable." Mr. Powell noted further in issuing the order, the FCC "misses an opportunity to review the assumptions and structural underpinnings of *the Universal Service Report and Order*." He expressed concern that the interpretation of the relevant sections of the Telecom Act of 1996 (specifically, section 254(h)(2)) offered "little guidance or discipline to this agency with respect to the range of 'advanced services' ... that the Commission may ultimately determine must be supported by universal service subsidies."⁴⁰

We share many of Commissioner Powell's concerns and extend his observations to the models being built to support the implementation of the universal service portion of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. There are numerous grounds upon which one might debate the validity of cost proxy models, particularly (in the present case) in the underlying assumptions regarding "scorched node" network design. Nevertheless, if one accepts the validity of this approach, we suggest that the models may be close to being "unobjectionable." Although certain minor structural issues must be addressed, the fundamental and truly substantive issues that remain are related to the inputs agreed upon for use in these models.

The specification of input values will not be a simple matter. The ubiquitous temptation will be to simply permit user adjustment of values for the sake of compromise.

⁴⁰ "Separate Statement of Commissioner Michael K. Powell," December 30, 1977, page 1, released in connection with FCC Common Carrier Action Report No. CC 97-61, *Commission Addresses Universal Services Issues Raised by Petitioners*, December 30, 1977. Comment related to Federal Communications Commission *Fourth Order on Reconsideration in CC Docket No. 96-45, Report and Order in CC Docket Nos. 96-45, 96-262, 94-1, 91-213, 95-72*, Released December 30, 1997.

This is not an acceptable approach to resolving the problem. The greater the alleged flexibility in input selection, the greater the risk of inappropriate and inaccurate results. The effect of modifying user inputs on the results of calculations is clearly shown in the example of standardizing structure-sharing assumptions. This is the next key step in implementing a cost proxy model.

We also recommend that the FCC provide clear and unambiguous definition of the direction in which model builders should direct their energy regarding "advanced services." We share Commissioner Powell's concern about the range of such services that must be accommodated. Consequently, we cannot agree with the Hatfield Model 5.0's sponsors when they claim that the network designed by their model will be capable of supporting any level of service which will receive service in the foreseeable future."⁴¹ Ignoring the veracity of that statement, we do not know with certainty what those services may be. It would be naïve and shortsighted to design a network using least cost, and therefore least capability, technology.

⁴¹ Correspondence: Richard N. Clarke to Magalie Roman Salas, Re: Ex Parte Presentation - Proxy Cost Models, December 11, 1997, attachment entitled: "Items in the Public Notice with which the Hatfield Model is in Conformance," paragraph IV.

Appendix A. Evaluation Criteria

[Excerpt from the Joint Board Recommendations to the FCC, Paragraph 277]⁴²

"The Joint Board recommends that the Commission use the following criteria to evaluate the reasonableness of any proxy model.

- (1) Technology assumed in the model should be the least-cost, most efficient and reasonable technology for providing the supported services that is currently available for purchase, with the understanding that the models will use the incumbent LEC's wire centers of the loop network for the reasonably foreseeable future.
- (2) Any network function or element, such as loop, switching, transport, or signaling, necessary to produce the supported services must have an associated cost.
- (3) Only forward-looking costs should be included.
- (4) A forward-looking cost of capital and the recovery of capital through economic depreciation expenses must be included.
- (5) The model should estimate the cost of providing services for all businesses and households within a geographic region. This includes the provision of multi-line business services to allow the models to reflect the economies of scale associated with the provision of these services.
- (6) A reasonable allocation of joint and common costs should be assigned to the costs of supported services. This allocation will ensure the forward-looking costs of providing the supported services do not include an unreasonable share of the joint and common costs incurred in the provision of both supported and unsupported services, e.g., multi-line business and toll services.
- (7) The models and all underlying data should be available to all interested parties for review and comment. The data should be verifiable, engineering assumptions reasonable, and outputs plausible.
- (8) The model should be able to examine and modify the critical assumptions and engineering principles. It should also allow for different costs of capital, depreciation and expenses for different facilities, functions, of elements."

⁴² Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, CC Docket 96-45, *Recommended Decision*, November 8, 1996, ("Joint Board Decision"), page 9, paragraph 277.

Appendix B. Comparison of Company Results

Data was taken from the output of the Hatfield Model 5.0 and Benchmark Cost Proxy Model 3.0.

The results from the models produced some questionable results. For example, the cost per loop was the same for the default sharing values and the 100% telco sharing. Although this data is included in the raw data files, it is not in the summary to this Appendix.

Company	HATFIELD				BCPM				DIFFERENCE		
	Default	100% Telco Sharing	Difference	Percent Difference	Default	100% Telco Sharing	Difference	Percent Difference	Default BCPM-Hatfield	100% BCPM-Hatfield	Ratio: 100%/ Default
	Average Monthly Cost				Average Monthly Cost						
Florida											
Alltel Florida	\$46.34	\$56.74	\$10.40	22.45%	\$ 67.60	\$ 72.12	\$ 4.52	6.69%	\$ 21.26	\$ 15.38	72.32%
Central Telephone Company	\$22.68	\$27.61	\$4.93	21.76%	\$ 36.48	\$ 38.08	\$ 1.60	4.38%	\$ 13.80	\$ 10.47	75.83%
Frontier Communications	\$53.22	\$66.15	\$12.93	24.29%	\$ 83.51	\$ 89.30	\$ 5.79	6.93%	\$ 30.29	\$ 23.15	76.43%
GTE Florida	\$15.08	\$18.09	\$3.01	19.94%	\$ 29.42	\$ 30.38	\$ 0.97	3.28%	\$ 14.34	\$ 12.30	85.76%
Indiantown Telephone System	\$37.96	\$46.23	\$8.27	21.79%	\$ 51.54	\$ 54.70	\$ 3.15	6.12%	\$ 13.58	\$ 8.47	62.33%
Northeast Florida Telephone Company	\$41.82	\$50.90	\$9.08	21.71%	\$ 55.87	\$ 59.27	\$ 3.41	6.10%	\$ 14.05	\$ 8.37	59.60%
Quincy Telephone Company	\$34.74	\$41.46	\$6.72	19.34%	\$ 51.18	\$ 54.28	\$ 3.10	6.06%	\$ 16.44	\$ 12.83	78.01%
BellSouth	\$15.40	\$18.09	\$2.69	17.44%	\$ 28.70	\$ 29.62	\$ 0.92	3.19%	\$ 13.30	\$ 11.53	86.70%
St Joseph Tel And Tel	\$44.31	\$53.79	\$9.48	21.39%	\$ 71.47	\$ 76.48	\$ 5.01	7.01%	\$ 27.16	\$ 22.69	83.55%
United Telephone of Florida	\$18.72	\$23.80	\$5.08	27.15%	\$ 36.48	\$ 38.08	\$ 1.60	4.38%	\$ 17.76	\$ 14.28	80.38%
Totals				21.73%				5.41%			
Georgia											
Alltel Georgia Inc	\$39.11	\$46.93	\$7.82	19.99%	\$ 56.30	\$ 59.89	\$ 3.59	6.38%	\$ 17.19	\$ 12.96	75.42%
Alma Telephone Company	\$54.03	\$67.20	\$13.17	24.37%	\$ 76.58	\$ 82.48	\$ 5.90	7.71%	\$ 22.55	\$ 15.28	67.78%
Brantley Telephone Company	\$70.81	\$88.84	\$18.03	25.46%	\$ 95.67	\$ 103.09	\$ 7.42	7.76%	\$ 24.85	\$ 14.25	57.32%
Bulloch County Rural Telephone Coop	\$59.32	\$73.90	\$14.59	24.59%	\$ 92.00	\$ 103.62	\$ 11.63	12.64%	\$ 32.68	\$ 29.72	90.94%
Coastal Utilities	\$25.57	\$29.96	\$4.39	17.18%	\$ 42.19	\$ 44.14	\$ 1.95	4.63%	\$ 16.62	\$ 14.18	85.31%
Georgia Alltel Telecom	\$48.97	\$59.81	\$10.84	22.13%	\$ 56.30	\$ 59.89	\$ 3.59	6.38%	\$ 7.33	\$ 0.08	1.16%
Georgia Telephone Corp	\$55.22	\$66.50	\$11.28	20.42%	\$ 74.81	\$ 80.39	\$ 5.58	7.46%	\$ 19.59	\$ 13.89	70.92%
Glenwood Telephone Company	\$100.37	\$126.56	\$26.20	26.10%	\$ 116.27	\$ 124.98	\$ 8.71	7.49%	\$ 15.90	\$ (1.59)	-9.99%
Hart Telephone Company	\$33.76	\$40.07	\$6.31	18.69%	\$ 52.82	\$ 55.96	\$ 3.14	5.95%	\$ 19.06	\$ 15.89	83.37%
Nelson-Ball Ground Telephone Company	\$44.28	\$53.15	\$8.87	20.03%	\$ 76.05	\$ 80.84	\$ 4.78	6.29%	\$ 31.78	\$ 27.69	87.15%
Pembroke Telephone Company	\$60.61	\$75.78	\$15.18	25.04%	\$ 75.16	\$ 80.42	\$ 5.27	7.01%	\$ 14.55	\$ 4.64	31.90%
Pineland Telephone Cooperative	\$64.29	\$80.72	\$16.43	25.56%	\$ 100.84	\$ 108.84	\$ 8.00	7.93%	\$ 36.55	\$ 28.12	76.93%

Company	HATFIELD				BCPM				DIFFERENCE		
	Default	100% Telco Sharing	Difference	Percent Difference	Default	100% Telco Sharing	Difference	Percent Difference	Default BCPM- Hatfield	100% BCPM- Hatfield	Ratio: 100%/ Default
	Average Monthly Cost				Average Monthly Cost						
Plant Telephone Company	\$65.55	\$81.52	\$15.97	24.36%	\$ 94.53	\$ 101.69	\$ 7.16	7.57%	\$ 28.98	\$ 20.18	69.61%
Planters Rural Telephone Coop	\$65.27	\$80.79	\$15.52	23.77%	\$ 88.69	\$ 98.14	\$ 9.45	10.65%	\$ 23.42	\$ 17.35	74.08%
Progressive Rural Telephone Coop	\$76.13	\$95.66	\$19.53	25.65%	\$ 113.41	\$ 126.03	\$ 12.62	11.13%	\$ 37.28	\$ 30.37	81.47%
Public Service Telephone Company	\$69.56	\$85.99	\$16.43	23.62%	\$ 92.01	\$ 98.80	\$ 6.79	7.38%	\$ 22.45	\$ 12.81	57.08%
Ringgold Telephone Company	\$28.97	\$34.20	\$5.23	18.06%	\$ 43.32	\$ 45.60	\$ 2.28	5.27%	\$ 14.35	\$ 11.40	79.46%
Southern Bell-GA	\$18.87	\$22.50	\$3.63	19.26%	\$ 33.79	\$ 35.26	\$ 1.47	4.35%	\$ 14.93	\$ 12.76	85.49%
Standard Telephone Company	\$37.86	\$45.63	\$7.77	20.52%	\$ 60.37	\$ 64.01	\$ 3.64	6.02%	\$ 22.51	\$ 18.38	81.64%
Trenton Telephone Company	\$50.45	\$60.00	\$9.55	18.93%	\$ 60.64	\$ 64.25	\$ 3.61	5.96%	\$ 10.19	\$ 4.25	41.72%
Waverly Hall Telephone Company	\$56.19	\$69.39	\$13.20	23.50%	\$ 88.05	\$ 93.93	\$ 5.88	6.68%	\$ 31.86	\$ 24.54	77.01%
Wilkes Tel And Electric Co	\$50.33	\$62.02	\$11.69	23.23%	\$ 82.75	\$ 91.15	\$ 8.40	10.15%	\$ 32.42	\$ 29.13	89.86%
Wilkinson County Tel Co Inc	\$53.73	\$66.19	\$12.46	23.18%	\$ 67.97	\$ 72.51	\$ 4.54	6.68%	\$ 14.23	\$ 6.32	44.39%
Totals				22.33%				7.37%			
Maryland											
Armstrong Telephone Company	\$29.61	\$34.33	\$4.72	15.95%	\$ 43.48	\$ 45.33	\$ 1.85	4.25%	\$ 13.88	\$ 11.00	79.28%
Bell Atlantic	\$16.65	\$19.60	\$2.95	17.73%	\$ 28.47	\$ 29.33	\$ 0.86	3.03%	\$ 11.82	\$ 9.73	82.31%
Totals				16.84%				3.64%			
Missouri											
Alltel Missouri Inc	\$102.92	\$120.23	\$17.31	16.82%	\$ 106.02	\$ 114.90	\$ 8.89	8.38%	\$ 3.10	\$ (5.33)	-172.02%
Alma Telephone Company	\$119.59	\$146.62	\$27.03	22.61%	\$ 152.94	\$ 164.74	\$ 11.80	7.71%	\$ 33.36	\$ 18.12	54.33%
Northeast Missouri Rural Tel Company	\$94.64	\$115.13	\$20.49	21.65%	\$ 214.83	\$ 234.03	\$ 19.20	8.94%	\$ 120.19	\$ 118.90	98.93%
Oregon Farmers Mutual Tel Company	\$66.25	\$82.22	\$15.97	24.11%	\$ 117.79	\$ 127.64	\$ 9.85	8.36%	\$ 51.55	\$ 45.42	88.11%
Ozark Telephone Company	\$56.33	\$67.08	\$10.75	19.09%	\$ 59.95	\$ 63.45	\$ 3.50	5.84%	\$ 3.62	\$ (3.63)	-100.09%
Peace Valley Telephone Company	\$204.37	\$237.11	\$32.75	16.02%	\$ 203.94	\$ 222.59	\$ 18.66	9.15%	\$ (0.43)	\$ (14.52)	3372.85%
Seneca Telephone Company	\$49.54	\$61.53	\$11.99	24.20%	\$ 73.78	\$ 83.01	\$ 9.23	12.51%	\$ 24.24	\$ 21.48	88.61%

Company	HATFIELD				BCPM				DIFFERENCE		
	Default	100% Telco Sharing	Difference	Percent Difference	Default	100% Telco Sharing	Difference	Percent Difference	Default BCPM-Hatfield	100% BCPM-Hatfield	Ratio: 100%/Default
	Average Monthly Cost				Average Monthly Cost						
Southwestern Bell-Missouri	\$18.75	\$22.46	\$3.71	19.80%	\$ 35.14	\$ 36.63	\$ 1.50	4.26%	\$ 16.39	\$ 14.17	86.49%
Steelville Telephone Exchange	\$71.72	\$90.67	\$18.95	26.42%	\$ 136.74	\$ 149.25	\$ 12.51	9.15%	\$ 65.02	\$ 58.58	90.09%
Sprint United	\$34.61	\$42.95	\$8.34	24.10%	\$ 56.93	\$ 60.67	\$ 3.74	6.57%	\$ 22.32	\$ 17.72	79.39%
Totals				21.48%				8.09%			
Montana											
Blackfoot Telephone Cooperative	\$148.78	\$190.81	\$42.03	28.25%	\$ 144.92	\$ 158.71	\$ 13.79	9.52%	\$ (3.87)	\$ (32.10)	830.51%
Citizens Telecommunications	\$75.60	\$93.47	\$17.87	23.63%	\$ 142.23	\$ 156.08	\$ 13.85	9.74%	\$ 66.62	\$ 62.61	93.98%
Hot Springs Telephone Company	\$132.95	\$162.37	\$29.42	22.13%	\$ 218.26	\$ 238.52	\$ 20.26	9.28%	\$ 85.31	\$ 76.15	89.26%
Lincoln Telephone Company	\$165.14	\$208.85	\$43.71	26.47%	\$ 429.20	\$ 473.91	\$ 44.71	10.42%	\$ 264.06	\$ 265.06	100.38%
Mid-Rivers Telephone Cooperative	\$293.52	\$389.08	\$95.56	32.56%	\$ 552.60	\$ 614.30	\$ 61.70	11.16%	\$ 259.08	\$ 225.21	86.93%
US West	\$25.29	\$31.24	\$5.95	23.55%	\$ 59.32	\$ 63.56	\$ 4.24	7.15%	\$ 34.03	\$ 32.32	94.97%
Nemont Telephone Cooperative	\$178.93	\$220.61	\$41.68	23.29%	\$ 348.78	\$ 384.55	\$ 35.77	10.26%	\$ 169.85	\$ 163.94	96.52%
Northern Telephone Cooperative	\$373.98	\$484.33	\$110.35	29.51%	\$ 653.87	\$ 723.26	\$ 69.39	10.61%	\$ 279.89	\$ 238.93	85.37%
Range Telephone Cooperative	\$474.61	\$611.73	\$137.12	28.89%	\$ 465.39	\$ 517.23	\$ 51.84	11.14%	\$ (9.22)	\$ (94.50)	1024.40%
Ronan Telephone Company	\$49.78	\$58.87	\$9.09	18.27%	\$ 70.72	\$ 74.86	\$ 4.14	5.86%	\$ 20.94	\$ 15.99	76.36%
Southern Montana Telephone Company	\$458.96	\$591.63	\$132.67	28.91%	\$ 1,334.84	\$ 1,481.40	\$ 146.56	10.98%	\$ 875.89	\$ 889.78	101.59%
Triangle Tel Cooperative Assn.	\$319.00	\$410.67	\$91.67	28.74%	\$ 384.75	\$ 425.60	\$ 40.85	10.62%	\$ 65.76	\$ 14.94	22.72%
Totals				26.18%				9.73%			

Universal Service Summary Sheet		100% Telco			
	Default	Sharing		Difference	Percent
Company	AMC (1)	AMC (1)			
Florida					
Alltel Florida Inc	\$46.34	\$56.74		\$10.40	22.45%
Central Tel Co Of Florida	\$22.68	\$27.61		\$4.93	21.76%
Floral Telephone Company-Fl	\$88.24	\$109.99		\$21.75	24.65%
Frontier Comm Of The South-Fl	\$53.22	\$66.15		\$12.93	24.29%
Gte Florida Inc	\$15.08	\$18.09		\$3.01	19.94%
Gulf Tel Co-Fl	\$47.23	\$58.38		\$11.15	23.61%
Indiantown Tel System	\$37.96	\$46.23		\$8.27	21.79%
Northeast Florida Tel Co Inc	\$41.82	\$50.90		\$9.08	21.71%
Quincy Tel Co-Fl Div	\$34.74	\$41.46		\$6.72	19.34%
Southern Bell-Fl	\$15.40	\$18.09		\$2.69	17.44%
St Joseph Tel And Tele Co	\$44.31	\$53.79		\$9.48	21.39%
United Tel Co Of Florida	\$18.72	\$23.80		\$5.08	27.15%
Vista-United Telecomm Systems	\$0.00	\$0.00		\$0.00	na
Totals					22.13%
Georgia					
Alltel Georgia Communications Corp	\$34.05	\$41.23		\$7.17	21.07%
Alltel Georgia Inc	\$39.11	\$46.93		\$7.82	19.99%
Alma Tel Co Inc	\$54.03	\$67.20		\$13.17	24.37%
Blue Ridge Tel Co	\$52.69	\$64.79		\$12.10	22.96%
Brantley Tel Co Inc	\$70.81	\$88.84		\$18.03	25.46%
Bulloch Cnty Rural Tel Coop Inc	\$59.32	\$73.90		\$14.59	24.59%
Camden Tel And Tel Co Inc-Ga	\$0.00	\$0.00		\$0.00	na
Chickamauga Tel Corp	\$35.35	\$41.08		\$5.73	16.21%
Citizens Tel Co Inc-Ga	\$57.94	\$71.86		\$13.92	24.03%
Coastal Utilities Inc	\$25.57	\$29.96		\$4.39	17.18%
Darien Tel Co Inc	\$57.88	\$71.24		\$13.36	23.08%
Ellijay Tel Co	\$0.00	\$0.00		\$0.00	na
Frontier Comm Of Fairmount Inc	\$58.89	\$72.10		\$13.21	22.44%
Frontier Comm Of Georgia Inc	\$19.78	\$22.59		\$2.82	14.26%
Georgia Alltel Telecom	\$48.97	\$59.81		\$10.84	22.13%
Georgia Tel Corp	\$55.22	\$66.50		\$11.28	20.42%
Glenwood Tel Co	\$100.37	\$126.56		\$26.20	26.10%
Hart Tel Co	\$33.76	\$40.07		\$6.31	18.69%
Hawkinsville Tel Co	\$0.00	\$0.00		\$0.00	na
Interstate Telephone Co	\$0.00	\$0.00		\$0.00	na
Nelson-Ball Ground Tel Co	\$44.28	\$53.15		\$8.87	20.03%
Pembroke Tel Co Inc	\$60.61	\$75.78		\$15.18	25.04%
Pineland Tel Coop	\$64.29	\$80.72		\$16.43	25.56%
Plant Tel Co	\$65.55	\$81.52		\$15.97	24.36%
Planters Rural Tel Coop Inc	\$65.27	\$80.79		\$15.52	23.77%
Progressive Rural Tel Coop Inc	\$76.13	\$95.66		\$19.53	25.65%
Public Service Tel Co	\$69.56	\$85.99		\$16.43	23.62%
Quincy Tel Co-Ga Div	\$66.46	\$83.11		\$16.64	25.04%
Ringgold Tel Co	\$28.97	\$34.20		\$5.23	18.06%
Southern Bell-Ga	\$18.87	\$22.50		\$3.63	19.26%
Standard Tel Co	\$37.86	\$45.63		\$7.77	20.52%
Trenton Tel Co	\$50.45	\$60.00		\$9.55	18.93%
Waverly Hall Tel Co Inc	\$56.19	\$69.39		\$13.20	23.50%
Wilkes Tel And Electric Co	\$50.33	\$62.02		\$11.69	23.23%
Wilkinson County Tel Co Inc	\$53.73	\$66.19		\$12.46	23.18%
Totals					22.65%
Maryland					
Armstrong Tel Co Of Md	\$29.61	\$34.33		\$4.72	15.95%
C And P Tel Co Of Md	\$16.65	\$19.60		\$2.95	17.73%
Totals					16.84%
Missouri					
Alltel Missouri Inc	\$102.92	\$120.23		\$17.31	16.82%

Universal Service Summary Sheet					
	Default	100% Telco Sharing		Difference	Percent Difference
Company	AMC (1)	AMC (1)			
Alma Telephone Company	\$119.59	\$146.62		\$27.03	22.61%
Bourbeuse Telephone Company	\$47.84	\$59.03		\$11.18	23.37%
Bps Tel Co	\$49.46	\$49.46		\$0.00	0.00%
Cass County Tel Co	\$56.20	\$56.20		\$0.00	0.00%
Chariton Valley Telephone Co	\$106.20	\$106.20		\$0.00	0.00%
Choctaw Telephone Company	\$71.10	\$71.10		\$0.00	0.00%
Citizens Telephone Co - Missouri	\$37.58	\$37.58		\$0.00	0.00%
Contel Sys Of Missouri Dba Gte Sys Of Missouri	\$43.61	\$43.61		\$0.00	0.00%
Craw - Kan Telephone Cooperative Inc - Missouri	\$98.22	\$98.22		\$0.00	0.00%
Ellington Telephone Company	\$190.34	\$190.34		\$0.00	0.00%
Fidelity Telephone Company	\$53.97	\$53.97		\$0.00	0.00%
Goodman Tel Co	\$51.12	\$51.12		\$0.00	0.00%
Granby Tel Co - Missouri	\$51.10	\$51.10		\$0.00	0.00%
Grand River Mutual Tel Corp - Mo	\$105.91	\$105.91		\$0.00	0.00%
Green Hills Telephone Corp	\$142.60	\$142.60		\$0.00	0.00%
Gte And Contel Of Missouri	\$43.12	\$43.12		\$0.00	0.00%
Gte North Inc - Missouri	\$33.42	\$33.42		\$0.00	0.00%
Holway Telephone Company	\$135.78	\$135.78		\$0.00	0.00%
Iamo Telephone Company - Mo	\$170.95	\$170.95		\$0.00	0.00%
Kingdom Telephone Company	\$92.50	\$92.50		\$0.00	0.00%
Klm Tel Co	\$106.31	\$106.31		\$0.00	0.00%
Lathrop Telephone Company	\$49.90	\$49.90		\$0.00	0.00%
Le-Ru Telephone Company	\$93.13	\$93.13		\$0.00	0.00%
Mark Twain Rural Telephone Co	\$149.76	\$149.76		\$0.00	0.00%
Medonald County Telephone Co	\$72.03	\$72.03		\$0.00	0.00%
Mid-Missouri Telephone Co	\$124.15	\$124.15		\$0.00	0.00%
Miller Telephone Company - Mo	\$84.82	\$84.82		\$0.00	0.00%
Mokan Dial Inc- Mo	\$72.13	\$72.13		\$0.00	0.00%
New Florence Telephone Co	\$60.46	\$60.46		\$0.00	0.00%
New London Tel Co	\$49.70	\$49.70		\$0.00	0.00%
Northeast Missouri Rural Tel Co	\$94.64	\$115.13		\$20.49	21.65%
Orchard Farm Telephone Company	\$49.94	\$61.68		\$11.74	23.51%
Oregon Farmers Mutual Tel Co	\$66.25	\$82.22		\$15.97	24.11%
Ozark Tel Co	\$56.33	\$67.08		\$10.75	19.09%
Peace Valley Telephone Co	\$204.37	\$237.11		\$32.75	16.02%
Rock Port Tel Co	\$79.74	\$92.10		\$12.35	15.49%
Seneca Tel Co	\$49.54	\$61.53		\$11.99	24.20%
Southwestern Bell-Missouri	\$18.75	\$22.46		\$3.71	19.80%
Steelville Tel Exch Inc	\$71.72	\$90.67		\$18.95	26.42%
Stoutland Telephone Company	\$101.28	\$131.29		\$30.01	29.63%
United Telephone Co Of Missouri	\$34.61	\$42.95		\$8.34	24.10%
Totals					7.31%
Montana					
3-Rivers Tel Cooperative Inc	\$189.52	\$239.74		\$50.22	26.50%
Blackfoot Tel Cooperative Inc	\$148.78	\$190.81		\$42.03	28.25%
Central Montana Communications Inc	\$172.24	\$221.00		\$48.76	28.31%
Citizens Telecommunications Co Of Monta	\$75.60	\$93.47		\$17.87	23.63%
Clark Fork Telecommunications Inc	\$133.17	\$166.38		\$33.21	24.94%
Hot Springs Tel Co	\$132.95	\$162.37		\$29.42	22.13%
Interbel Tel Cooperative Inc	\$117.22	\$142.98		\$25.76	21.98%
Lincoln Tel Co Inc	\$165.14	\$208.85		\$43.71	26.47%
Mid-Rivers Tel Cooperative Inc	\$293.52	\$389.08		\$95.56	32.56%
Mountain Bell-Montana	\$25.29	\$31.24		\$5.95	23.55%
Nemont Telephone Coop- Montana	\$178.93	\$220.61		\$41.68	23.29%
Northern Tel Coop Inc- Mt	\$373.98	\$484.33		\$110.35	29.51%
Northwestern Telephone Systems Inc	\$35.97	\$42.90		\$6.93	19.27%
Project Tel Co	\$168.30	\$219.75		\$51.46	30.57%
Range Tel Cooperative Inc-Wy	\$474.61	\$611.73		\$137.12	28.89%
Ronan Tel Co	\$49.78	\$58.87		\$9.09	18.27%
Southern Montana Tel Co	\$458.96	\$591.63		\$132.67	28.91%
Triangle Tel Cooperative Assn Inc	\$319.00	\$410.67		\$91.67	28.74%
Totals					25.88%

Company Selected Results
for FL, GA, MD, MO and MT
(Using default and modified inputs)

Page 3 of 3

Hatfield Model 5.0 (Default)
**Company Selected Results
for FL, GA, MD, MO and MT
(Using default inputs)**

Universal Service Summary Sheet								FEDERAL FUND ANALYSIS	
Company	AMC (1)	Total Switched Lines	Primary residence lines	Secondary residence lines	Single line business lines	Multi-line business lines	Public lines	Annual Support for line types	Primary residence lines
Florida									
Alltel Florida Inc	\$46.34	69,029	53,339	3,768	751	10,613	557,985,677	\$	11,187,644.87
Central Tel Co Of Florida	\$22.68	376,044	218,300	16,853	9,662	128,830	2396,967,676	\$	15,378,439.41
Florida Telephone Company-Fl	\$88.24	1,980	1,771	125	33	47	3,923,401,423	\$	1,214,728.54
Frontier Comm Of The South-Fl	\$53.22	3,767	3,296	240	56	164	10,789,278,97	\$	876,610.32
Gte Florida Inc	\$15.08	2,084,068	1,410,490	113,506	65,625	480,393	14,052,0863	\$	1,755,387.20
Gulf Tel Co-Fl	\$47.23	8,900	6,284	457	230	1,828	101,021,3079	\$	1,726,099.56
Indiantown Tel System	\$37.96	3,486	2,309	248	94	791	43,462,410,26	\$	314,350.19
Northeast Florida Tel Co Inc	\$41.82	7,508	5,532	544	138	1,227	67,025,017,56	\$	1,104,951.33
Quincy Tel Co-Fl Div	\$34.74	12,939	8,836	673	241	3,028	160,523,196	\$	1,474,156.25
Southern Bell-Fl	\$15.40	5,731,892	3,753,383	300,779	201,884	1,472,294	3547,139,755	\$	15,348,893.58
St Joseph Tel And Tele Co	\$44.31	29,057	21,467	1,609	469	5,231	279,905,6474	\$	4,986,929.34
United Tel Co Of Florida	\$18.72	1,426,503	976,075	76,333	46,073	318,419	9593,167,539	\$	14,338,158.59
Vista-United Telecomm Systems	\$0.00	3,463	579	44	4	2,703	132,933,0444	\$	-
Totals		9,758,637	6,461,662	515,179	325,261	2,425,568	30,946,930,25	\$	69,706,349.19
Georgia									
Alltel Georgia Inc	\$39.11	54,540	38,603	3,949	831	10,595	561,017,4627	\$	5,592,672.52
Alltel Georgia Communications Corp	\$34.05	271,316	174,549	16,297	6,551	71,183	2728,662,79	\$	21,824,470.14
Alma Tel Co Inc	\$54.03	6,478	4,704	476	108	1,129	60,730,149,15	\$	1,504,042.21
Blue Ridge Tel Co	\$52.69	7,882	6,964	697	13	197	10,311,976,06	\$	1,825,778.10
Brantley Tel Co Inc	\$70.81	4,164	3,665	343	9	140	7,310,945,034	\$	1,753,672.82
Bulloch Cnty Rural Tel Coop Inc	\$59.32	8,098	7,243	632	19	193	10,437,289,85	\$	2,456,943.67
Camden Tel And Tel Co Inc-Ga	\$0.00	18,770	13,079	1,172	356	3,951	211,504,5967	\$	-
Chickamauga Tel Corp	\$35.35	5,652	4,691	435	99	403	24,657,160,45	\$	238,930.88
Citizens Tel Co Inc-Ga	\$57.94	4,717	3,274	334	42	1,015	51,887,190,15	\$	1,094,769.54
Coastal Utilities Inc	\$25.57	32,701	23,836	2,218	389	5,947	311,099,3974	\$	1,022,705.07
Darien Tel Co Inc	\$57.88	4,120	3,740	380	0	0	0	\$	1,205,228.84
Ellijay Tel Co	\$0.00	10,378	7,387	704	121	2,058	107,012,5968	\$	-
Frontier Comm Of Fairmount Inc	\$58.89	2,116	1,687	165	43	209	12,354,403,31	\$	561,540.96
Frontier Comm Of Georgia Inc	\$19.78	22,790	15,542	1,292	506	5,171	278,743,7925	\$	-
Georgia Alltel Telecom	\$48.97	80,102	59,030	5,410	1,342	13,580	732,688,7798	\$	16,387,822.86
Georgia Tel Corp	\$55.22	6,636	4,504	389	150	1,511	81,574,620,78	\$	1,374,559.81
Glenwood Tel Co	\$100.37	674	604	70	0	0	0	\$	506,474.79
Hart Tel Co	\$33.76	9,029	6,486	585	139	1,726	91,605,77969	\$	587,386.37
Hawkinsville Tel Co	\$0.00	4,516	3,171	339	97	862	47,057,754	\$	-
Interstate Telephone Co	\$0.00	4,686	2,178	219	118	2,065	107,167,4863	\$	-
Nelson-Ball Ground Tel Co	\$44.28	5,932	4,946	379	42	537	28,425,487,44	\$	794,435.51
Pembroke Tel Co Inc	\$60.61	3,108	2,732	244	15	111	6,147,070,177	\$	933,058.23
PineLand Tel Coop	\$64.29	11,463	8,637	850	92	1,791	92,456,575,18	\$	4,259,444.66
Plant Tel Co	\$65.55	8,622	6,578	809	55	1,121	57,787,448,73	\$	2,931,848.15
Planters Rural Tel Coop Inc	\$65.27	7,607	6,492	612	48	431	23,537,792,06	\$	2,662,445.40
Progressive Rural Tel Coop Inc	\$76.13	3,991	3,623	328	3	36	1,919,504,777	\$	1,964,747.87
Public Service Tel Co	\$69.56	9,195	7,626	812	60	661	35,380,0188	\$	3,621,742.29
Quincy Tel Co-Ga Div	\$66.46	662	618	43	0	0	0	\$	263,035.44

Hatfield Model 5.0 (Default)
**Company Selected Results
for FL, GA, MD, MO and MT
(Using default inputs)**

Universal Service Summary Sheet							
Company	Secondary residence lines	Single line business lines	Midline business lines	Public lines	Support cost if all lines supported	Total annual support for specified lines	\$30.00
Florida							
Alltel Florida Inc	\$ 821,602.16	\$ 845.58	\$ 912.04	\$ 86.30	\$ 12,011,090.95	\$ 11,188,490.45	\$ 17,948,975.30
Central Tel Co Of Florida	\$ 1,163,713.93	\$ 39,166.44	\$ 362,251.08	\$ 6,947.57	\$ 16,950,518.43	\$ 15,417,605.85	\$ 23,264,131.22
Floral Telephone Company-Fl	\$ 85,901.68	\$ 15,477.98	\$ 22,221.07	\$ 1,851.11	\$ 1,340,180.38	\$ 1,230,206.53	\$ 1,448,529.65
Frontier Comm Of The South-Fl	\$ 63,804.43	\$ 2,099.11	\$ 6,145.74	\$ 404.84	\$ 949,064.45	\$ 878,709.44	\$ 1,311,723.84
Gte Florida Inc	\$ 152,271.19	\$ 36,801.16	\$ 184,388.93	\$ 5,692.45	\$ 2,134,540.92	\$ 1,792,188.36	\$ 10,557,352.40
Gulf Tel Co-Fl	\$ 150,580.29	\$ 885.84	\$ 1,278.44	\$ 106.27	\$ 1,878,950.40	\$ 1,726,985.40	\$ 2,416,938.23
Indiantown Tel System	\$ 27,884.56	\$ 3,558.41	\$ 60,771.22	\$ 3,158.73	\$ 409,723.11	\$ 317,908.60	\$ 486,864.45
Northeast Florida Tel Co Inc	\$ 85,894.05	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,190,845.37	\$ 1,104,951.33	\$ 1,765,548.78
Quincy Tel Co-Fl Div	\$ 116,432.43	\$ 130.58	\$ 827.81	\$ 47.06	\$ 1,591,594.13	\$ 1,474,286.83	\$ 2,266,630.84
Southern Bell-Fl	\$ 1,192,604.01	\$ 188,633.23	\$ 1,138,117.37	\$ 2,811.03	\$ 17,871,059.22	\$ 15,537,526.81	\$ 49,564,012.02
St Joseph Tel And Tele Co	\$ 342,357.91	\$ 1,474.42	\$ 741.93	\$ 108.83	\$ 5,331,612.42	\$ 4,988,403.76	\$ 7,318,361.89
United Tel Co Of Florida	\$ 1,126,864.07	\$ 176,758.31	\$ 755,529.88	\$ 24,537.19	\$ 16,421,848.04	\$ 14,514,916.90	\$ 36,277,751.22
Vista-United Telecomm Systems	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Totals	\$ 5,329,910.69	\$ 465,831.06	\$ 2,533,185.51	\$ 45,751.38	\$ 78,081,027.84	\$ 70,172,180.26	\$ 154,627,839.82
Georgia							
Alltel Georgia Inc	\$ 540,653.89	\$ 947.18	\$ 387.40	\$ 65.53	\$ 6,134,726.52	\$ 5,593,619.70	\$ 9,899,150.79
Alltel Georgia Communications Corp	\$ 1,927,350.59	\$ 5,038.84	\$ 22,223.78	\$ 956.98	\$ 23,780,040.33	\$ 21,829,508.98	\$ 36,676,122.54
Alma Tel Co Inc	\$ 154,335.45	\$ 4,275.82	\$ 58,383.32	\$ 3,076.70	\$ 1,724,113.50	\$ 1,508,318.03	\$ 2,080,501.97
Blue Ridge Tel Co	\$ 181,418.96	\$ 735.29	\$ 10,850.68	\$ 568.90	\$ 2,019,351.93	\$ 1,826,513.39	\$ 2,734,843.86
Brantley Tel Co Inc	\$ 163,579.82	\$ 1,919.11	\$ 30,877.50	\$ 1,610.39	\$ 1,951,659.63	\$ 1,755,591.93	\$ 2,237,401.87
Bulloch Cnty Rural Tel Coop Inc	\$ 217,018.06	\$ 2,241.98	\$ 21,571.89	\$ 1,169.31	\$ 2,698,944.91	\$ 2,459,185.65	\$ 3,413,077.33
Camden Tel And Tel Co Inc-Ga	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Chickamauga Tel Corp	\$ 22,154.55	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 261,085.43	\$ 238,930.88	\$ 858,098.64
Citizens Tel Co Inc-Ga	\$ 106,618.87	\$ 2,365.98	\$ 58,880.58	\$ 3,007.34	\$ 1,265,642.31	\$ 1,097,135.52	\$ 1,526,948.02
Coastal Utilities Inc	\$ 88,693.73	\$ 1,034.43	\$ 4,769.86	\$ 285.00	\$ 1,117,488.10	\$ 1,023,739.50	\$ 2,445,308.69
Darien Tel Co Inc	\$ 123,837.80	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,329,066.64	\$ 1,205,228.84	\$ 1,698,922.76
Ellijay Tel Co	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Frontier Comm Of Fairmount Inc	\$ 54,971.71	\$ 4,590.64	\$ 22,395.32	\$ 1,325.07	\$ 644,823.71	\$ 566,131.60	\$ 784,205.59
Frontier Comm Of Georgia Inc	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 473,145.04
Georgia Alltel Telecom	\$ 1,449,316.56	\$ 39,497.83	\$ 247,590.70	\$ 14,096.69	\$ 18,138,324.63	\$ 16,427,320.69	\$ 23,198,358.14
Georgia Tel Corp	\$ 126,792.92	\$ 775.55	\$ 7,786.68	\$ 420.42	\$ 1,510,335.39	\$ 1,375,335.36	\$ 1,969,055.05
Glenwood Tel Co	\$ 54,622.78	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 561,097.57	\$ 506,474.79	\$ 586,267.51
Hart Tel Co	\$ 53,402.24	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 640,788.61	\$ 587,386.37	\$ 1,308,246.06
Hawkinsville Tel Co	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Interstate Telephone Co	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Nelson-Ball Ground Tel Co	\$ 62,420.53	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 856,856.04	\$ 794,435.51	\$ 1,447,281.72
Pembroke Tel Co Inc	\$ 82,835.10	\$ 7,599.77	\$ 48,438.83	\$ 2,751.62	\$ 1,074,683.54	\$ 940,658.00	\$ 1,293,707.12
Pineland Tel Coop	\$ 409,322.74	\$ 6,032.09	\$ 91,066.95	\$ 4,767.78	\$ 4,770,634.22	\$ 4,265,476.75	\$ 5,305,602.47
Plant Tel Co	\$ 334,262.61	\$ 5,656.58	\$ 122,506.44	\$ 6,293.09	\$ 3,400,566.87	\$ 2,937,504.72	\$ 3,800,182.72
Planters Rural Tel Coop Inc	\$ 250,591.30	\$ 8,681.24	\$ 81,329.74	\$ 4,419.74	\$ 3,007,467.42	\$ 2,671,126.64	\$ 3,519,339.91
Progressive Rural Tel Coop Inc	\$ 179,120.67	\$ 640.96	\$ 6,771.11	\$ 363.95	\$ 1,965,388.83	\$ 1,965,388.83	\$ 2,442,920.07
Public Service Tel Co	\$ 396,227.42	\$ 6,304.35	\$ 87,669.59	\$ 4,614.33	\$ 4,116,557.98	\$ 3,628,046.64	\$ 4,628,412.43
Quincy Tel Co-Ga Div	\$ 18,501.33	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 281,536.77	\$ 263,035.44	\$ 344,627.10

Hatfield Model 5.0 (Default)

Company Selected Results
for FL, GA, MD, MO and MT
(Using default inputs)

Universal Service Summary Sheet						
Total Annual Support for Primary Residence Lines at Pre-Selected Monthly Benchmarks						
Company	\$30.00	\$40.00	\$50.00	\$60.00	\$70.00	\$80.00
Florida						
Alltel Florida Inc	\$ 11,786,154.60	\$ 6,180,454.09	\$ 1,257,499.76	\$ 1,079,595.15	\$ 901,690.54	\$ 723,785.93
Central Tel Co Of Florida	\$ 16,050,771.39	\$ 9,327,451.60	\$ 3,427,939.24	\$ 2,954,023.71	\$ 2,480,108.18	\$ 2,006,192.66
Floral Telephone Company-Fl	\$ 1,235,983.19	\$ 1,023,436.73	\$ 810,890.27	\$ 598,343.81	\$ 385,797.35	\$ 173,250.88
Frontier Comm Of The South-Fl	\$ 916,166.10	\$ 520,608.36	\$ 125,050.62	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Gte Floridainc	\$ 1,866,402.03	\$ 1,562,066.95	\$ 1,347,266.68	\$ 1,132,466.40	\$ 917,666.12	\$ 702,865.84
Gulf Tel Co-Fl	\$ 1,781,168.20	\$ 1,456,108.81	\$ 1,217,867.29	\$ 1,053,591.68	\$ 889,316.08	\$ 725,040.47
Indiantown Tel System	\$ 330,033.30	\$ 200,160.20	\$ 139,862.66	\$ 79,565.12	\$ 19,267.58	\$ -
Northeast Florida Tel Co Inc	\$ 1,165,005.64	\$ 574,841.63	\$ 487,092.73	\$ 420,699.62	\$ 354,306.51	\$ 287,913.40
Quincy Tel Co-Fl Div	\$ 1,546,199.39	\$ 825,767.95	\$ 105,336.51	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Southern Bell-Fl	\$ 18,114,719.89	\$ 4,321,460.26	\$ 3,273,046.50	\$ 2,224,632.73	\$ 1,176,218.97	\$ 127,805.20
St Joseph Tel And Tele Co	\$ 5,197,381.78	\$ 3,100,252.05	\$ 2,437,482.54	\$ 2,041,953.23	\$ 1,646,423.91	\$ 1,250,894.60
United Tel Co Of Florida	\$ 16,031,671.67	\$ 8,282,712.51	\$ 6,970,075.56	\$ 5,657,438.62	\$ 4,344,801.67	\$ 3,032,164.73
Vista-United Telecomm Systems	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Totals	\$ 76,021,687.18	\$ 37,375,361.14	\$ 21,599,460.34	\$ 17,242,370.06	\$ 13,115,666.91	\$ 9,029,993.71
Georgia						
Alltel Georgia Inc	\$ 5,910,267.77	\$ 2,734,315.26	\$ 943,038.68	\$ 823,951.77	\$ 704,864.86	\$ 585,777.95
Alltel Georgia Communications Corp	\$ 22,816,849.63	\$ 12,893,054.77	\$ 5,115,904.14	\$ 4,203,633.49	\$ 3,291,362.85	\$ 2,379,092.20
Alma Tel Co Inc	\$ 1,549,911.07	\$ 1,091,222.44	\$ 632,533.80	\$ 199,866.37	\$ 155,569.01	\$ 111,271.68
Blue Ridge Tel Co	\$ 1,899,169.43	\$ 1,198,788.64	\$ 502,133.68	\$ 106,774.32	\$ 63,995.09	\$ 21,215.85
Brantley Tel Co Inc	\$ 1,797,648.19	\$ 1,357,894.51	\$ 918,140.83	\$ 478,387.15	\$ 124,269.72	\$ 114,153.69
Bulloch Cnty Rural Tel Coop Inc	\$ 2,543,864.91	\$ 1,674,652.49	\$ 820,752.53	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Camden Tel And Tel Co Inc-Ga	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Chickamauga Tel Corp	\$ 295,218.86	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Citizens Tel Co Inc-Ga	\$ 1,134,058.50	\$ 741,488.90	\$ 366,189.74	\$ 160,466.46	\$ 134,083.67	\$ 107,700.88
Coastal Utilities Inc	\$ 1,116,209.62	\$ 181,164.14	\$ 100,787.66	\$ 59,767.77	\$ 18,747.88	\$ -
Darien Tel Co Inc	\$ 1,250,110.10	\$ 869,252.51	\$ 601,987.89	\$ 334,723.28	\$ 130,785.20	\$ 41,116.77
Ellijay Tel Co	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Frontier Comm Of Fairmount Inc	\$ 581,783.20	\$ 379,360.81	\$ 176,938.42	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Frontier Comm Of Georgia Inc	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Georgia Alltel Telecom	\$ 16,943,820.26	\$ 11,878,059.19	\$ 6,965,924.71	\$ 4,229,353.91	\$ 3,525,281.22	\$ 2,821,208.53
Georgia Tel Corp	\$ 1,428,604.83	\$ 888,154.61	\$ 347,704.40	\$ 287,049.02	\$ 229,039.73	\$ 171,030.43
Glenwood Tel Co	\$ 513,728.68	\$ 441,189.84	\$ 368,651.01	\$ 296,112.17	\$ 223,573.34	\$ 151,034.50
Hart Tel Co	\$ 652,919.07	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Hawkinsville Tel Co	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Interstate Telephone Co	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Nelson-Ball Ground Tel Co	\$ 853,785.16	\$ 277,877.72	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Pembroke Tel Co Inc	\$ 965,844.49	\$ 637,981.87	\$ 334,541.45	\$ 44,241.94	\$ 2,827.80	\$ 2,707.80
Pineland Tel Coop	\$ 4,353,657.69	\$ 3,411,527.45	\$ 2,469,397.22	\$ 1,527,266.99	\$ 804,752.25	\$ 639,335.04
Plant Tel Co	\$ 3,010,787.65	\$ 2,273,771.37	\$ 1,565,541.81	\$ 857,312.24	\$ 264,766.65	\$ 215,094.09
Planters Rural Tel Coop Inc	\$ 2,740,344.90	\$ 1,961,349.89	\$ 1,182,354.88	\$ 403,359.87	\$ 114,947.52	\$ 94,015.38
Progressive Rural Tel Coop Inc	\$ 2,008,218.07	\$ 1,573,516.07	\$ 1,138,814.07	\$ 704,112.07	\$ 424,464.32	\$ 341,395.38
Public Service Tel Co	\$ 3,713,257.76	\$ 2,822,358.10	\$ 2,028,403.43	\$ 1,234,448.75	\$ 566,878.89	\$ 436,603.81
Quincy Tel Co-Ga Div	\$ 270,452.86	\$ 196,278.63	\$ 122,104.40	\$ 47,930.17	\$ -	\$ -

Hatfield Model 5.0 (Default)

Company Selected Results
for FL, GA, MD, MO and MT
(Using default inputs)

Universal Service Summary Sheet								FEDERAL FUND ANALYSIS	
Company	AMC (1)	Total Switched Lines	Primary residence lines	Secondary residence lines	Single line business lines	Multiline business lines	Public lines	Amount Support for Line Types	Primary residence lines
Ringgold Tel Co	\$28.97	11,545	8,945	910	122	1,489	79,076,0663	\$	371,744.28
Southern Bell-Ga	\$18.87	3,649,626	2,197,699	212,107	106,584	1,118,214	15015,08914	\$	54,097,156.99
Standard Tel Co	\$37.86	56,551	43,751	3,992	429	7,966	412,259,5368	\$	5,380,409.69
Trenton Tel Co	\$50.45	5,228	4,323	382	15	483	24,466,48604	\$	1,037,964.04
Waverly Hall Tel Co Inc	\$56.19	1,134	996	100	8	28	1,756,563,887	\$	300,763.24
Wilkes Tel And Electric Co	\$50.33	11,802	8,565	808	258	2,058	113,702,4606	\$	2,276,638.43
Wilkinson County Tel Co Inc	\$53.73	3,773	3,005	265	31	449	23,564,07057	\$	783,243.20
Totals		4,349,603	2,693,475	258,746	118,696	1,257,309	21351,39293	\$	139,615,676.02
Maryland									
Armstrong Tel Co Of Md	\$29.61	5,967	4,505	473	230	713	46,303,66695	\$	41,610.72
C And P Tel Co Of Md	\$16.65	3,350,092	1,926,799	234,084	89,085	1,065,748	34375,3629	\$	21,698,197.34
Totals		3,356,059	1,931,304	234,557	89,315	1,066,461	34421,66656	\$	21,739,808.06
Missouri									
Alltel Missouri Inc	\$102.92	52,675	44,225	825	1,042	6,223	356,730,033	\$	39,907,802.69
Alma Telephone Company	\$119.59	300	297	3	0	0	0	\$	315,513.93
Bourbeuse Telephone Company	\$47.84	1,895	1,536	39	30	275	14,971,03201	\$	308,036.77
Bps Tel Co	\$49.46	3,321	2,617	103	101	473	28,178,74391	\$	674,932.16
Cass County Tel Co	\$56.20	6,317	5,253	90	152	775	45,534,39227	\$	1,656,702.38
Chariton Valley Telephone Co	\$106.20	6,901	6,442	93	47	301	17,117,92428	\$	5,958,335.33
Choctaw Telephone Company	\$71.10	499	453	9	4	31	1,735,081,576	\$	217,343.99
Citizens Telephone Co - Missouri	\$37.58	3,912	2,976	85	219	593	39,857,86247	\$	324,564.64
Contel Sys Of Missouri Dba Gte Sys Of Missouri	\$43.61	51,739	38,588	1,120	1,851	9,807	371,727,9622	\$	9,665,958.23
Craw - Kan Telephone Cooperative Inc - Missouri	\$98.22	1,982	1,948	32	1	1	0,102,063,917	\$	1,570,929.05
Ellington Telephone Company	\$190.34	1,266	1,248	17	0	0	0	\$	2,379,096.74
Fidelity Telephone Company	\$53.97	12,631	9,525	329	596	2,050	129,954,6577	\$	3,008,517.26
Goodman Tel Co	\$51.12	1,683	1,496	47	18	116	6,578,575,611	\$	374,727.51
Granby Tel Co - Missouri	\$51.10	2,661	2,295	38	41	271	15,334,74699	\$	542,945.79
Grand River Mutual Tel Corp - Mo	\$105.91	13,115	10,829	204	228	1,755	97,359,03583	\$	11,064,838.13
Green Hills Telephone Corp	\$142.60	3,076	3,009	57	2	8	0,490,614,831	\$	4,031,107.16
Gte And Contel Of Missouri	\$43.12	221,950	171,670	3,723	4,826	40,283	1438,223,498	\$	41,270,847.46
Gte North Inc - Missouri	\$33.42	116,183	85,214	1,662	4,088	24,313	904,847,52	\$	11,880,564.82
Holway Telephone Company	\$135.78	533	485	7	3	36	1,919,504,702	\$	607,207.99
Iamo Telephone Company - Mo	\$170.95	1,005	988	15	1	1	0,102,063,917	\$	1,661,562.94
Kingdom Telephone Company	\$92.50	3,904	3,824	69	2	8	0,490,614,831	\$	2,827,150.97
Klm Tel Co	\$106.31	1,416	1,211	16	35	145	8,809,742,153	\$	1,197,238.98
Lathrop Telephone Company	\$49.90	1,293	1,112	27	19	127	7,207,511,425	\$	283,730.06
Le-Ru Telephone Company	\$93.13	1,204	1,170	25	4	4	0,408,255,659	\$	872,302.14
Mark Twain Rural Telephone Co	\$149.76	3,579	3,474	55	5	42	2,327,760,428	\$	4,962,520.36
McDonald County Telephone Co	\$72.03	2,376	2,301	53	0	21	1,020,634,174	\$	1,143,017.74
Mid-Missouri Telephone Co	\$124.15	3,493	3,112	46	78	241	15,659,12673	\$	3,556,317.77
Miller Telephone Company - Mo	\$84.82	938	915	16	0	6	0,306,191,742	\$	592,782.35
Mokan Dial Inc- Mo	\$72.13	705	593	6	29	72	4,948,544,744	\$	291,335.99
New Florence Telephone Co	\$60.46	307	303	4	0	0	0	\$	107,248.54

Hatfield Model 5.0 (Default)

Company Selected Results for FL, GA, MD, MO and MT (Using default inputs)

Universal Service Summary Sheet							
Company	Secondary residence lines	Single line business lines	Multi-line business lines	Public lines	Support cost if all lines supported	Total annual support for specified lines	FPL/DO
Ringgold Tel Co	\$ 38,500.23	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 410,244.51	\$ 371,744.28	\$ 1,057,910.51
Southern Bell-Ga	\$ 5,071,522.77	\$ 55,258.21	\$ 179,141.90	\$ 2,873.57	\$ 59,405,953.45	\$ 54,152,415.21	\$ 106,894,297.33
Standard Tel Co	\$ 497,323.71	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,877,733.40	\$ 5,380,409.69	\$ 10,582,596.15
Trenton Tel Co	\$ 93,818.33	\$ 66.67	\$ 8,094.02	\$ 400.71	\$ 1,140,343.77	\$ 1,038,030.71	\$ 1,608,636.21
Waverly Hall Tel Co Inc	\$ 30,109.20	\$ 554.75	\$ 2,066.55	\$ 128.71	\$ 333,622.44	\$ 301,317.98	\$ 432,277.09
Wilkes Tel And Electric Co	\$ 217,522.81	\$ 5,199.37	\$ 23,578.35	\$ 1,413.05	\$ 2,524,352.02	\$ 2,281,837.80	\$ 3,318,543.83
Wilkinson County Tel Co Inc	\$ 69,702.84	\$ 820.82	\$ 56,335.44	\$ 2,806.50	\$ 912,908.80	\$ 784,064.03	\$ 1,179,899.78
Totals	\$ 13,016,549.51	\$ 160,237.46	\$ 1,192,716.60	\$ 57,415.40	\$ 154,042,594.99	\$ 139,775,913.48	\$ 239,745,908.33
Maryland							
Armstrong Tel Co Of Md	\$ 4,703.78	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 46,314.50	\$ 41,610.72	\$ 513,970.52
C And P Tel Co Of Md	\$ 2,595,534.10	\$ 14,981.61	\$ 125,521.97	\$ 4,182.30	\$ 24,438,417.33	\$ 21,713,178.95	\$ 57,055,659.04
Totals	\$ 2,600,237.88	\$ 14,981.61	\$ 125,521.97	\$ 4,182.30	\$ 24,484,731.82	\$ 21,754,789.67	\$ 57,569,649.56
Missouri							
Alltel Missouri Inc	\$ 756,759.56	\$ 430,879.62	\$ 2,393,483.14	\$ 138,682.53	\$ 43,627,607.55	\$ 40,338,682.31	\$ 45,745,445.84
Alma Telephone Company	\$ 3,502.71	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 319,016.64	\$ 315,513.93	\$ 354,698.74
Bourbeuse Telephone Company	\$ 7,826.75	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 315,863.52	\$ 308,036.77	\$ 510,752.01
Bps Tel Co	\$ 19,208.04	\$ 1,356.46	\$ 1,294.57	\$ 130.17	\$ 696,921.40	\$ 676,288.62	\$ 1,020,323.54
Cass County Tel Co	\$ 25,639.93	\$ 16,840.02	\$ 53,767.91	\$ 3,467.01	\$ 1,756,417.24	\$ 1,673,542.40	\$ 2,350,105.98
Chariton Valley Telephone Co	\$ 82,820.49	\$ 12,691.15	\$ 80,985.80	\$ 4,599.75	\$ 6,139,432.51	\$ 5,971,026.47	\$ 6,808,623.79
Choctaw Telephone Company	\$ 4,154.58	\$ 1,027.85	\$ 8,052.23	\$ 445.85	\$ 231,024.51	\$ 218,371.84	\$ 277,112.89
Citizens Telephone Co - Missouri	\$ 10,190.35	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 334,754.99	\$ 324,564.64	\$ 642,787.11
Contel Sys Of Missouri Dba Gte Sys Of Missouri	\$ 186,237.51	\$ 28,359.21	\$ 93,694.63	\$ 3,891.92	\$ 9,978,141.51	\$ 9,694,317.44	\$ 13,265,206.31
Craw - Kan Telephone Cooperative Inc - Missouri	\$ 25,904.94	\$ 481.39	\$ 519.23	\$ 49.13	\$ 1,597,883.74	\$ 1,571,410.44	\$ 1,828,017.53
Ellington Telephone Company	\$ 41,663.72	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,420,760.47	\$ 2,379,096.74	\$ 2,543,895.95
Fidelity Telephone Company	\$ 63,239.55	\$ 38,370.84	\$ 76,981.02	\$ 5,664.03	\$ 3,192,772.71	\$ 3,046,888.10	\$ 4,265,870.27
Goodman Tel Co	\$ 10,549.25	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 385,276.77	\$ 374,727.51	\$ 572,152.23
Granby Tel Co - Missouri	\$ 7,849.38	\$ 2,970.12	\$ 32,130.87	\$ 1,723.54	\$ 587,619.70	\$ 545,915.92	\$ 845,879.34
Grand River Mutual Tel Corp - Mo	\$ 191,244.87	\$ 18,948.04	\$ 103,268.48	\$ 6,001.10	\$ 11,384,300.63	\$ 11,083,786.17	\$ 12,494,302.12
Green Hills Telephone Corp	\$ 76,965.82	\$ 1,999.68	\$ 6,393.59	\$ 412.13	\$ 4,116,878.37	\$ 4,033,106.83	\$ 4,428,243.49
Gte And Contel Of Missouri	\$ 813,320.32	\$ 34,839.81	\$ 204,695.72	\$ 7,637.16	\$ 42,331,340.46	\$ 41,305,687.27	\$ 56,573,116.43
Gte North Inc - Missouri	\$ 185,775.95	\$ 33,387.15	\$ 106,430.05	\$ 4,454.57	\$ 12,210,612.54	\$ 11,913,951.97	\$ 17,711,917.10
Holway Telephone Company	\$ 8,918.81	\$ 3,664.96	\$ 38,716.53	\$ 2,081.03	\$ 660,589.32	\$ 610,872.95	\$ 671,236.21
Iamo Telephone Company - Mo	\$ 24,093.56	\$ 844.47	\$ 910.85	\$ 86.19	\$ 1,687,498.02	\$ 1,662,407.42	\$ 1,792,009.32
Kingdom Telephone Company	\$ 50,909.85	\$ 212.11	\$ 678.18	\$ 43.72	\$ 2,878,994.83	\$ 2,827,363.08	\$ 3,331,962.28
Klm Tel Co	\$ 16,038.91	\$ 3,100.46	\$ 16,682.07	\$ 971.37	\$ 1,234,031.78	\$ 1,200,339.44	\$ 1,357,123.76
Lathrop Telephone Company	\$ 5,177.87	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 288,907.93	\$ 283,730.06	\$ 430,524.19
Le-Ru Telephone Company	\$ 18,530.75	\$ 2,095.76	\$ 2,260.49	\$ 213.90	\$ 895,403.05	\$ 874,397.91	\$ 1,026,766.92
Mark Twain Rural Telephone Co	\$ 76,069.73	\$ 6,641.56	\$ 40,786.30	\$ 2,328.81	\$ 5,088,346.77	\$ 4,969,161.92	\$ 5,421,088.60
Mcdonald County Telephone Co	\$ 21,656.95	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,164,674.69	\$ 1,143,017.74	\$ 1,446,764.77
Mid-Missouri Telephone Co	\$ 52,725.32	\$ 56,996.87	\$ 147,589.05	\$ 10,045.63	\$ 3,823,674.65	\$ 3,613,314.65	\$ 3,967,054.29
Miller Telephone Company - Mo	\$ 10,437.85	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 29.55	\$ 603,851.57	\$ 592,782.35	\$ 713,528.36
Mokan Dial Inc - Mo	\$ 3,167.83	\$ 7,681.57	\$ 19,315.52	\$ 1,325.62	\$ 322,826.54	\$ 299,017.56	\$ 369,658.58
New Florence Telephone Co	\$ 1,432.41	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 108,680.95	\$ 107,248.54	\$ 147,297.40

Hatfield Model 5.0 (Default)

Company Selected Results
for FL, GA, MD, MO and MT
(Using default inputs)

Universal Service Summary Sheet						
Total Annual Support for Primary Residence Lines at Pre-Selected Monthly Penetration						
Company	\$30.00	\$40.00	\$50.00	\$60.00	\$70.00	\$80.00
Ringgold Tel Co	\$ 428,067.05	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Southern Bell-Ga	\$ 58,091,842.97	\$ 18,144,983.19	\$ 10,627,358.10	\$ 9,156,143.67	\$ 7,684,929.25	\$ 6,213,714.83
Standard Tel Co	\$ 5,843,093.77	\$ 1,848,624.36	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Trenton Tel Co	\$ 1,089,843.33	\$ 571,336.29	\$ 198,197.68	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Waverly Hall Tel Co Inc	\$ 312,719.04	\$ 193,160.99	\$ 73,602.93	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Wilkes Tel And Electric Co	\$ 2,370,004.33	\$ 1,436,345.34	\$ 576,871.50	\$ 476,454.96	\$ 376,038.42	\$ 275,621.88
Wilkinson County Tel Co Inc	\$ 819,302.89	\$ 458,706.00	\$ 125,086.03	\$ 88,718.95	\$ 52,351.87	\$ 15,984.79
Totals	\$ 147,305,416.10	\$ 72,136,455.39	\$ 38,303,010.99	\$ 25,720,135.33	\$ 18,893,599.55	\$ 14,738,155.48
Maryland						
Armstrong Tel Co Of Md	\$ 50,673.12	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
C And P Tel Co Of Md	\$ 23,888,374.00	\$ 1,986,607.37	\$ 787,304.07	\$ 550,804.38	\$ 314,304.68	\$ 77,804.98
Totals	\$ 23,939,077.12	\$ 1,986,647.37	\$ 787,354.07	\$ 550,864.38	\$ 314,374.68	\$ 77,884.98
Missouri						
Alltel Missouri Inc	\$ 40,438,497.52	\$ 35,131,549.19	\$ 29,824,600.86	\$ 24,533,930.87	\$ 19,563,250.07	\$ 14,898,596.42
Alma Telephone Company	\$ 319,076.19	\$ 283,453.64	\$ 247,831.08	\$ 212,208.53	\$ 176,585.98	\$ 140,963.43
Bourbeuse Telephone Company	\$ 326,465.43	\$ 142,178.85	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Bps Tel Co	\$ 706,331.38	\$ 480,377.69	\$ 362,523.37	\$ 244,669.06	\$ 170,788.38	\$ 147,121.96
Cass County Tel Co	\$ 1,719,739.07	\$ 1,159,860.45	\$ 794,416.96	\$ 428,973.48	\$ 309,693.54	\$ 235,899.89
Chariton Valley Telephone Co	\$ 6,035,634.28	\$ 5,262,644.77	\$ 4,489,655.26	\$ 3,721,393.88	\$ 3,054,667.64	\$ 2,387,941.41
Choctaw Telephone Company	\$ 222,777.53	\$ 168,442.16	\$ 114,106.80	\$ 59,771.43	\$ 5,436.07	\$ -
Citizens Telephone Co - Missouri	\$ 348,501.43	\$ 130,111.60	\$ 77,181.63	\$ 66,919.47	\$ 56,657.31	\$ 46,395.15
Contel Sys Of Missouri DbA Gte Sys Of Missouri	\$ 9,916,684.51	\$ 7,802,616.43	\$ 5,836,343.63	\$ 3,870,070.82	\$ 2,495,905.93	\$ 2,004,068.50
Craw - Kan Telephone Cooperative Inc - Missouri	\$ 1,594,300.73	\$ 1,360,583.93	\$ 1,126,867.13	\$ 893,150.33	\$ 659,433.53	\$ 425,716.73
Ellington Telephone Company	\$ 2,394,078.49	\$ 2,244,261.03	\$ 2,094,443.57	\$ 1,944,626.12	\$ 1,794,808.66	\$ 1,644,991.20
Fidelity Telephone Company	\$ 3,122,822.08	\$ 2,215,846.88	\$ 1,612,374.81	\$ 1,047,252.37	\$ 502,158.10	\$ 396,168.28
Goodman Tel Co	\$ 392,675.21	\$ 213,198.20	\$ 118,381.65	\$ 46,112.25	\$ 23,660.59	\$ 21,402.91
Granby Tel Co - Missouri	\$ 570,485.21	\$ 331,499.84	\$ 212,229.63	\$ 108,760.22	\$ 5,290.81	\$ -
Grand River Mutual Tel Corp - Mo	\$ 11,194,789.40	\$ 9,897,595.00	\$ 8,686,362.00	\$ 7,564,589.82	\$ 6,506,917.12	\$ 5,449,244.42
Green Hills Telephone Corp	\$ 4,067,210.46	\$ 3,706,177.43	\$ 3,345,144.39	\$ 2,984,111.36	\$ 2,623,078.33	\$ 2,262,045.30
Gte And Contel Of Missouri	\$ 42,502,576.49	\$ 30,185,286.18	\$ 17,867,995.88	\$ 14,093,617.99	\$ 11,681,728.86	\$ 9,269,839.74
Gte North Inc - Missouri	\$ 12,220,983.04	\$ 8,816,800.84	\$ 5,412,618.63	\$ 3,294,350.19	\$ 2,718,640.29	\$ 2,142,930.39
Holway Telephone Company	\$ 613,028.74	\$ 554,821.26	\$ 496,613.79	\$ 438,406.31	\$ 380,198.83	\$ 321,991.36
Iamo Telephone Company - Mo	\$ 1,673,421.70	\$ 1,554,834.09	\$ 1,436,246.48	\$ 1,317,658.87	\$ 1,199,071.26	\$ 1,080,483.65
Kingdom Telephone Company	\$ 2,873,042.91	\$ 2,414,123.53	\$ 1,955,204.16	\$ 1,526,081.31	\$ 1,144,988.95	\$ 763,896.60
Klm Tel Co	\$ 1,211,773.96	\$ 1,066,424.15	\$ 921,074.35	\$ 804,479.38	\$ 732,154.90	\$ 659,830.42
Lathrop Telephone Company	\$ 297,074.98	\$ 237,471.29	\$ 198,095.03	\$ 158,718.77	\$ 119,342.51	\$ 79,966.25
Le-Ru Telephone Company	\$ 886,344.39	\$ 745,921.87	\$ 605,499.35	\$ 465,076.82	\$ 324,654.30	\$ 184,231.77
Mark Twain Rural Telephone Co	\$ 5,004,208.38	\$ 4,587,328.17	\$ 4,170,447.95	\$ 3,753,567.74	\$ 3,336,687.52	\$ 2,919,807.31
McDonald County Telephone Co	\$ 1,170,631.10	\$ 894,497.44	\$ 636,155.16	\$ 500,521.42	\$ 364,887.69	\$ 229,253.96
Mid-Missouri Telephone Co	\$ 3,593,657.46	\$ 3,220,260.62	\$ 2,846,863.78	\$ 2,473,466.95	\$ 2,100,070.11	\$ 1,746,703.85
Miller Telephone Company - Mo	\$ 603,759.26	\$ 493,990.15	\$ 384,221.05	\$ 286,717.53	\$ 230,695.08	\$ 174,672.64
Mokan Dial Inc- Mo	\$ 298,456.22	\$ 227,253.86	\$ 156,051.50	\$ 84,849.14	\$ 13,646.78	\$ -
New Florence Telephone Co	\$ 110,889.35	\$ 74,481.30	\$ 38,073.25	\$ 1,665.20	\$ -	\$ -

Hatfield Model 5.0 (Default)

Company Selected Results for FL, GA, MD, MO and MT (Using default inputs)

Universal Service Summary Sheet								
Company	AMC (1)	Total Switched Lines	Primary residence lines	Secondary residence lines	Single line business lines	Multi-line business lines	Total lines	FEDERAL FUND ANALYSIS Amount Available for New Support Primary residence lines
New London Tel Co	\$49.70	810	721	21	15	49	3,188,998,938	\$ 168,826.31
Northeast Missouri Rural Tel Co	\$54.64	7,568	6,163	107	173	1,064	60,716,346,74	\$ 5,227,469.49
Orchard Farm Telephone Company	\$49.94	756	544	10	45	147	9,461,736,202	\$ 122,008.18
Oregon Farmers Mutual Tel Co	\$66.25	1,069	868	13	30	149	8,784,572,601	\$ 413,435.79
Ozark Tel Co	\$56.33	1,782	1,540	29	26	177	9,969,929,457	\$ 464,061.11
Peace Valley Telephone Co	\$204.37	365	360	5	0	0	0	\$ 746,347.04
Rock Port Tel Co	\$79.74	1,635	1,150	25	102	336	21,533,147,81	\$ 740,827.26
Seneca Tel Co	\$49.54	2,847	2,332	56	106	332	21,497,622,28	\$ 591,840.21
Southwestern Bell-Missouri	\$18.75	2,352,337	1,611,746	31,991	89,593	584,357	34,645,740,11	\$ 62,516,394.72
Steelville Tel Exch Inc	\$71.72	4,063	3,215	64	51	697	36,699,728,62	\$ 1,901,872.09
Stoutland Telephone Company	\$101.28	1,096	1,074	17	0	4	0,204,127,833	\$ 905,993.70
United Telephone Co Of Missouri	\$34.61	227,577	153,651	3,175	7,930	60,086	27,333,656,211	\$ 27,821,886.03
Totals		3,124,763	2,192,469	44,327	111,494	735,377	41,063,394,22	\$ 254,876,241.80
Montana								
3-Rivers Tel Cooperative Inc	\$189.52	13,398	11,543	761	131	906	50,884,635,56	\$ 22,182,544.52
Blackfoot Tel Cooperative Inc	\$148.78	6,524	5,579	480	76	365	21,671,386	\$ 7,892,203.92
Central Montana Communications Inc	\$172.24	6,636	5,628	375	36	556	29,080,810,86	\$ 9,757,184.38
Citizens Telecommunications Co Of Monta	\$75.60	8,117	5,821	378	440	1,387	89,742,226,12	\$ 3,538,097.23
Clark Fork Telecommunications Inc	\$133.17	7,192	5,560	299	159	1,106	62,095,270,87	\$ 6,504,562.13
Hot Springs Tel Co	\$132.95	638	562	30	6	35	2,001,863,919	\$ 687,438.26
Interbel Tel Cooperative Inc	\$117.22	1,256	1,146	72	8	28	1,778,036,281	\$ 1,184,282.25
Lincoln Tel Co Inc	\$165.14	806	755	51	0	0	0	\$ 1,214,989.28
Mid-Rivers Tel Cooperative Inc	\$293.52	10,050	7,711	579	186	1,482	81,904,543,5	\$ 27,716,559.44
Mountain Bell-Montana	\$25.29	334,859	227,463	18,844	18,851	66,044	36,452,461,37	\$ 23,645,855.06
Nemont Telephone Coop- Montana	\$178.93	13,194	10,169	714	409	1,788	107,858,557,7	\$ 20,216,063.07
Northern Tel Coop Inc- Mt	\$373.98	1,167	1,040	79	3	43	2,245,396,249	\$ 4,253,260.01
Northwestern Telephone Systems Inc	\$35.97	53,982	35,990	2,890	2,797	11,596	706,709,558,3	\$ 5,324,878.05
Project Tel Co	\$168.30	4,101	3,454	252	42	312	17,359,684,02	\$ 5,963,945.69
Range Tel Cooperative Inc-Wy	\$474.61	3,042	2,828	203	0	0	0	\$ 15,069,822.84
Ronan Tel Co	\$49.78	3,366	2,239	173	166	744	44,882,837,1	\$ 598,890.96
Southern Montana Tel Co	\$458.96	775	719	51	0	0	0	\$ 3,696,523.33
Triangle Tel Cooperative Assn Inc	\$319.00	7,557	7,063	446	2	27	1,428,889,915	\$ 24,241,927.96
Totals		476,659	335,268	26,674	23,310	86,419	486,468,983,4	\$ 183,689,028.38
(1) AMC is taken from the "input" sheet of the HM Summary Tool file (the USF summary does not include this info)								
HM 5.0 run with original inputs/variables on 1/1-3/98								
Individual State/Company reports consolidated using the Model's built in "Summarize" Tool								
For sanity's sake we're only looking at the results for the "Federal Fund Analysis", unless otherwise noted								
funding is for benchmarks of \$31 for primary residence & \$51 for single line business lines								